MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., May 28,1929.

The tenth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1929 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, May 28, 1929.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Garfield,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Vitale,
Mr. Winter,
Mr. Cross,
Mr. Weinman,

also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer. There was also present Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall, of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held April 25, 1929, were approved.

2. EXPEDITIONARY MEDAL, MARINE CORPS: Under date of May 1, 1929, the following letter was received from Brigadier General B. H. Fuller, Acting Commandant of the Marine Corps, with which he submitted a revised design for the proposed Expeditionary Medal:

"As the representative of the Major General Commandant, in his temporary absence, I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 22 March, returning, with stamped notice of disapproval, the proposed design of the Marine Corps expeditionary medal which was submitted for advice as to its merits, in pursuance of Executive Order No.3524,of July 28,1921.

Your suggestion that the services of a recognized medallist be obtained to design the expeditionary medal has been given careful consideration. It is understood, however, that services of this nature are personal services, and as such 'are for performance by regular employees of the Government, subject to proper supervision, and may not be performed otherwise,' as stated in 6 Comp.Gen.180. In the

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman
Mr. Merrill
Mr. Morse
Mr. Hitch
Mr. Gibbon
Mr. Grove
Mr. Coleman

also Mr. C. D. Carpenter, Secretary, Secretary
and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

The minutes of the regular meeting held April 30, 1970, were approved.

1. Minutes of [illegible]: The minutes of the
following letter was received from Delphian Corp. dated May 1, 1970, the
[illegible] of the Marina Corp., [illegible] a revised design for
the proposed [illegible]:

"As the representative of the Major Federal Government, in the
[illegible] plan, I am [illegible] the request on your letter of [illegible]
to its merits, in reference to [illegible] or May [illegible]
[illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible]
[illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

absence of a statute providing for the employment of an outside medalist, it follows that the work of design must be performed within the Government service, whether by an artist under the Marine Corps or other branch of the Government, or by an outside medalist who has established his eligibility through the Civil Service Commission. In the latter case, the compensation of the medalist for the work of design would necessarily be fixed on a per diem basis at a rate not exceeding the maximum compensation allowed by the Classification Act, but as to this phase of the matter, it can not now be definitely stated whether Marine Corps appropriations could be made available for the payment of a design so obtained.

Headquarters Marine Corps is in complete accord with your evident desire to obtain a design of artistic merit which will be fully worthy of award by the Marine Corps, but under existing conditions it appears that it will first be necessary for the design to be made by an artist, sculptor, or designer who is a regular employee of the Government. Accordingly, this office enlisted the services of an artist and illustrator of standing who is an officer of the Marine Corps, Captain John W. Thomason, Jr., U.S.M.C., and submits, for advice as to its merits, a pen sketch of a proposed design made by Captain Thomason for the obverse of the expeditionary medal. For the reverse, it is desired to use the reverse inscribed "United States Marine Corps For service" approved by the Commission of Fine Arts for the Dominican Campaign medal, a sample of such medal being enclosed.

The expeditionary medal is intended for award for expeditionary and operations which are in line with the function of the Marine Corps as the landing force of the U. S. Navy, and the sketch, which represents the Marine Corps colors under escort of a Marine color guard clad in the service uniform as usually worn under these conditions, may be taken as suggestive of the particular service which the expeditionary medal should signify. A design of merely general character, however artistic and beautiful in itself, would not serve this purpose.

Your offer of cooperation is very much appreciated."

The design was referred to Mr. Weinman, who reported that it had merit, but the designer was referred to as an illustrator, and before undertaking to execute the medal, he should be asked to submit a plastic sketch of the design. Mr. Weinman also suggested siplifying the design. The Commission concurred in the criticisms and recommendations of Mr. Weinman, and the Marine Corps was informed accordingly (Exhibit A).

5. BUST OF SPEAKER GILLETT: Mr. Moore said some time ago Hon. Robert Luce, Chairman of the Committee on the Library, House of Representatives,

had brought to his attention a bust of Ex-Speaker Gillett, made by Joseph A. Atchison, sculptor, of this city, and that he had requested Mr. Atchison to bring the bust to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts for criticism. Also, Mr. Moore said, he had spoken to Senator Gillett about the matter, who had written as follows:

"April 6, 1929.

Dear Mr. Moore:

"I knew nothing about my bust until you spoke to me about it yesterday, and I find a resolution was introduced in the House in the last Congress by the late Congressman Gallivan, to have the government purchase it. I never knew of it until yesterday, and would not have permitted it if it had been brought to my attention, for the House appropriates for a painting of each Speaker and I think that is quite enough. Therefore, if the matter has been referred to you, as you intimated ~~xxxxx~~ ,by the Committee, I wish you would report that it has now, for the first time, come to my attention, and that I do not wish any such appropriation made, and, regardless of the merits of the bust, would like to have you report against it.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. Gillett".

The bust was brought to the attention of Mr. Weinman, who said the bust gave indication that it was hastily done, and lacked qualities of a work of art, and therefore he disapproved it. The Commission concurred in this criticism, and a report, disapproving the bust was sent to Representative Luce. (Exhibit B).

4. FLAGPOLE, CITY POST OFFICE: Under date of May 14, 1929, the following letter was received from Hon. Walter F. Brown, Postmaster General, asking the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to the re-erection of a flagpole on the city post office:

"On the morning following the recent violent wind storm of May 2, 1929, a decided list was noted in the tubular steel flagpole mounted on the roof of the City Post Office Building at North Capitol Street and Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.

The Supervising Architect's office, after investigation, recommended that the flag be removed, the pole taken down, and consideration given to shortening the pole, omitting the eagle and substituting therefor the standard ball now used on post office buildings. The flag was removed and the pole taken down and securely fastened to the roof.

This flagpole was located on the main roof, at the ridge and

about the middle of the Massachusetts Avenue front, its top being sixty feet above the ridge of the roof. It is composed of four sections of steel tubes and was surmounted by an eagle with a wing spread of approximately six feet. This eagle, presenting an area of about fifteen square feet of resistance in addition to the flag, was no doubt a very severe strain on the joints in the pole.

The Department is now endeavoring to determine whether the pole should be repaired or replaced with a new one and in the meantime I would appreciate your consideration of the suggestion that the eagle be omitted and the pole shortened when it is again raised.

The matter was brought to the attention of the architect members of the Commission and also to the architects Graham, Anderson, Probst and White, of Chicago (successors to the architects of the building). They concurred in the recommendations of the Supervising Architect's Office, and suggested a 40 foot flagpole without the eagle. The Commission concurred in this recommendation and the Postmaster General was informed accordingly (Exhibit C).

5. MEMORIAL TO SAMUEL GOMPERS, A. F. L. Mr. Moore stated that on May 21, 1929, he was in conference with President William Green and Secretary Frank Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, who advised that they were having a competition for preliminary sketches for the Memorial to Samuel Compers, for which time has been allowed by the A. F. L. to about September 1st. Mr. Moore stated that he had suggested that they withhold further action in the matter pending the expiration of the time set for receiving these sketches, and that this was satisfactory to Mr. Green and to Mr. Morrison; thereupon the sketches will be brought to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission thought this a satisfactory arrangement.

6. MEMORIAL TO WILLIAM RUFUS KING: Mr. Moore stated that Representative Abernethy, of North Carolina, is interested in securing a suitable memorial to William Rufus King, at Clinton, N. D., for which Congress has enacted legislation, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the

United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to erect a tablet or marker in commemoration of Wm. Rufus King, former Vice President of the United States, at the place of his birth, Clinton, Sampson County, North Carolina, on ground furnished by such town, after the plans and specifications for such tablet or marker have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this Act." Approved May 23, 1928 45 Stat. p.719.

The War Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1930, approved February 28, 1929(Public No.843, 70th Congress, page 34), contains the following provision:

"Monument to William Rufus King: For every expenditure requisite for or incident to the payment of the cost of erecting at Clinton, Sampson County, North Carolina, a tablet or marker in commemoration of William Rufus King, former Vice President of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the Act approved May 23, 1928 (45 Stat. p.719), $2,500."

The secretary stated that in talking with Representative Abernethy about the matter he had suggested a memorial fountain, with possibly a medallion and inscription. It is proposed to place the memorial on the Court House Square at Clinton, and it is probable the residents of Clinton will add $1,000 or so to the amount appropriated by Congress. Representative Abernethy will communicate with residents of Clinton and advise the Commission further in regard to the project.

7. UNITED MASONIC TEMPLE: Under date of May 23, 1929, the following letter was received from Mr. Harvey Wiley Corbett, Architect, 130 West 42d Street, New York City, requesting advice as to the United Masonic Temple, to be built on the Dean Tract, at Connecticut and Florida Avenues, N.W., of this city, and of which he is the architect:

"You will recall that some time ago I showed you the pictures of the proposed United Masonic Temple, to be located on Temple Heights

between Connecticut and Florida Avenues. I am enclosing a set of photographs of these same drawings.

At the time you will remember I explained that the height restriction of 90', which obtains under the Zoning Act of Washington, would make the realization of this project as shown impossible. You were kind enough to express the opinion that in a project of this importance and public interest, involving as it does the creation of considerable park area in a rapidly developing residential center of the city, should not come under the restrictions of the Zoning Ordinance.

I took the matter up with the District Commissioners but found they were powerless to authorize an excess height under any circumstances and that an Act of Congress would be necessary. I therefore drew up an Act asking for excess height, applicable only over the area of the central dominant buildings except the central one are far below the permitted height in this district, the excess height asked for being so far removed from street and property lines that it would not interfere in the slightest with any neighboring buildings. In fact, in order to make the group effective as an outstanding feature of the City, it should have excess height at this one point. Otherwise it would be buried in the surrounding 90' apartments which you know in the course of time will be erected in this District.

In the Act as drawn I placed a final paragraph stating that the designs were to be subject to the approval of The Commission of Fine Arts and the Park and Planning Commission. It is my idea to create here not something which would establish a precedent in opposition to existing height regulations for the City of Washington, with which I am thoroughly in sympathy; but it seemed to me that in view of the value to the City of such a development as compared with what would happen if the Masonic Fraternity were to abandon this site and turn it over to private development, that the concession asked for is worth while.

I am writing a letter similar to this to Frederic A. Delano of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as I understand he is looking into this question through Captain Chisholm for the purpose of presenting it before the Commission. The same day that I saw you I presented this matter to Mr. Delano and he was entirely sympathetic to the idea, just as you were. I should appreciate hearing from you in this regard.

Sincerely yours,
Harvey Wiley Corbett."

The Commission considered the question of height limit very carefully. The secretary had secured a copy of S.686, and it was understood to be the one referred to by Mr. Corbett. Attention was called to the Bill. Mr. Morris said he did not think the Bill meets the situation and that it should be amended so as to give assurance that no further building will be built on the land in the Dean Tract not used for the Temple, so as to assure the building a

good landscape setting in the future; the unoccupied space should be dedicated in consideration of the waiver in height limit. It was thought the Bill could be amended so as to state that no further building should be erected on the Dean Tract without the consent of Congress; or it might be sufficient to state,- without the consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Attention was called to the Press Club Building, at 14th and F Streets, N.W., for which Congress enacted special legislation to change the zoning height as pertaining to that building, as follows:

National Press Club Building

'An Act to amend an Act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1,1910.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia', approved June 1, 1910, be, and it is hereby, amended by adding at the end of paragraph 5 of said Act the following proviso:

And further provided, That the building to be erected on lots 813, 814, and 820, in square 254, located on the southeast corner of Fourteenth and F Streets, northwest, be permitted to be erected to a height not to exceed one hundred and forty feet above the F Street curb.'

Approved April 16, 1926. 44 Stat. p.298.

Mr. Corbett was informed of the recommendations of the Commission, with a suggested revision of the Bill (Exhibit D-1).

3. CIRCLE AT MASSACHUSETTS AND NEBRASKA AVENUES: Mr. Moore said that Mr. Greenleaf was in the city a few days ago, and during a trip about the city, an inspection was made of the site proposed for the General Artemas Ward statue at Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, at which the Commission had recommended a Circle. Protests against a 500 foot Circle (which is as large as Dupont Circle) having been received, Mr. Greenleaf said a 300 foot Circle would be ample, and that this would encroach little on private property in the locality.

The plan was inspected by the Commission, and the general lay-out of the Circle shown was considered further. It was noted in particular that the radiating streets were not isometric and the Commission recommended a restudy

" If I had the say, I would suggest that what
has been accomplished at the present time
be turned over to one very able designer [illegible]
a view that constructive criticism and sug-
gestions from one person might result in a
unification of the whole composition; if this
could be accomplished, I believe it would be
highly beneficial to the artistic quality of
the whole work. "

of the Circle. Mr. Weinman said, so far as the actual Circle is concerned, if it is 50 or 75 feet in diameter, it would be sufficient for the landscape setting of the statue itself, so that a 300 foot Circle should give ample space for the circulating roadway. The matter is to be brought to the attention of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

9. MODEL FOR THE TRIANGLE: Mr. Moore asked the opinion of the members as to the model for the Triangle, which was inspected during the meeting of the Commission on April 25th. Mr. Garfield thought the designers had done very well; the Justice Building did not appeal to him particularly, and he regarded the Archives Building as having been hastily arranged for the purposes of exhibiting the model at that time. Mr. Morris was of the same opinion as Mr. Garfield, and before commenting further asked if the individual buildings (Labor, Justice, Archives, Independent Offices, Interstate Commerce) had been assigned for designing as indicated on the model. Mr. Moore replied that he understood this was the case. Mr. Morris thereupon said the model seemed to him to have been done 'in Commission form. It is one big composition, representing the work of a group of people and anything of that kind that a Commission or a group of people will do will be to a certain extent a compromise. If I had the say I would suggest that what has been accomplished at the present time be turned over to one designer for the purpose of unifying the whole composition, so that it will represent the work of one mind'.

Mr. Moore explained that Mr. Bennett, as chairman of the Architectural Board of Consultants, is supposed to be the man who is to do this unifying, but Mr. Bennett has not had the experience of a great architect to do this, and there is no question that the Commission of Fine Arts must take the matter in hand and straighten out and complete the model. Mr. Moore said that last week

Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Greenleaf saw the model separately, on different days, and each had decided criticisms to make concerning it; also yesterday Mr. Kendall made a careful inspection of the model (which is on exhibition at the west entrance of the Treasury Department Building), and observed serious defects. Mr. Cross said he had not seen the model (illness having prevented his presence at the April meeting), but it seemed to him from pictures he had seen of the model that improvements could be made in it.

A general discussion of the model followed, during which attention was called in particular to the following features that might be considered defects, at any rate such as to require attention:

1. Department of Labor building, next to Commerce on B Street: The pediment is out of place. There is nothing back of the entrance of sufficient importance to call for a pediment at this place.

2. The character of the design of the Department of Justice building is not in harmony with the rest of the group; there is no need for a building with a circular entrance where it faces the Mall; also it does not take into consideration the Cross Axis of the Mall, indicated by the Plan of 1901, and of which the Patent Office, at 8th and F Streets, forms a part.

3. The design of the Archives Building (with the General Accounting Office which is to surround it) is of course far from complete.

4. It seems that the present District Building at 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, will remain there a long time, as it is too good a building for Congress to consent to tearing it down soon; it should therefore be brought into the scheme of the model.

5. There are details of architectural composition that need attention. For example, the little tower opposite the Willard Hotel, on Pennsylvania Avenue, seems out of place; there are many columns and pilasters in some places and none at other places in the model where it would seem well to have them. There are parts of the model not well related to each other,--a great many curves. Attention was called to the Louvre with its "twenty types of architecture", monumental and dignified.

On the whole, the Commission felt strongly that the models needs a unified treatment, and that for this the model should be placed into the hands of a great architect like John Russell Pope, who would put freshness into the the model, and at the same time adhere to classical motives. As a former

member of the Commission and acquainted with the Washington development, Mr. Pope would also relate the Model for the Triangle to the Plan of the National Capital.

10. FORT SUMTER MEMORIAL FLAGPOLE: Mr. Moore reported that he had been in Charleston, S. C., during the week of May 6th, and had gone over the matter of plans for Fort Sumter with Simons and Lapham, Architects, of Charleston, and with Major Meade, the Army Officer in charge there; and that he had informed the Executors, who were providing funds for the flagpole through the bequest made, accordingly (Exhibit E). Mr. Moore said the architects are at work on the revised plans and have so reported in the following letter:

COPY

May 22, 1929

John Burlinson Coleman, Esq.,
50 Broad Street,
New York, N. Y. Re: Lawton Estate

Dear Mr. Coleman:

We have your letter of May 20th and in reply would state that we are now going forward with the revised plans for the Anderson Memorial.

Mr. Moore's visit to Charleston was most helpful and cleared up a number of obstructions and difficulties. As the scheme now adopted and approved by Mr. Moore is quite different from previous studies, it will require an entirely new set of drawings and estimates which will take some time to complete.

Mr. Moore furnished us with the text for the inscription. This, we have not had before and will now enable us to estimate the cost of the stone work much more accurately than in the past when the nature and length of the inscription was unknown.

As soon as we have definite data in the way of the drawings and estimates, we will forward them to you without delay.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

Albert Simons."

The design of the new flagpole submitted by the architects was inspected by the Commission. Mr. Kendall had drawn a sketch suggesting a square base, saying that the architects would find it difficult to place a medallion and inscription on a round base, whereas a square base would provide a frame for

the medallion. Mr. Kendall's sketch also suggested several steps leading to the Memorial Flagpole. The Commission regarded Mr. Kendall's sketch for the base an improvement over that of Simons and Lapham, and they were informed accordingly (Exhibit F).

11. HANDRAIL FOR CONNECTICUT AVENUE BRIDGE: Mr. C. H. Whyte, Engineer of Bridges of the District of Columbia, submitted a drawing of a proposed new Handrail for the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, showing balusters. He said the balusters would form a Handrail of sufficient strength to make the proposed chain and posts at the sidewalk edge of the bridge unnecessary; also, children would be apt to swing the chain and this would be annoying to traffic over the bridge.

The Commission approved the design, with the suggestion that a model of the baluster be made and submitted, before placing the new Handrail on the bridge (Exhibit G).

12. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Under date of May 8, 1939, Col. Grant submitted the following letter, with copy of a letter received from Mr. Olmsted (Exhibit H) and plans suggesting a change in the Plaza treatment of Columbia Island, with particular reference to the Lee Highway:

> "I inclose a copy of a letter from Mr. Olmsted, together with blueprint, to which he refers, believing that you will be interested in his views. I should be glad to hear from you whether you think there is any recommendation made by Mr. Olmsted which would make it desirable for the Commission of Fine Arts to again consider this subject and possibly modify the decisions reached by it at the last meeting.
>
> Of course, Mr. Olmsted's recommendations are always deserving of consideration, but the matters discussed are to such an extent a question of opinion and the suggestions made were probably in the minds of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts when they reached their decision at the last meeting. Therefore, I am not sure that you will wish to give the question of Columbia Island reconsideration."

The plans had been referred to Mr. Vitale, with request that he take up the matter with Mr. Kendall. Mr. Vitale reported that he talked with Mr. Kendall

about the plans, and that while the Commission had approved his plan for Columbia Island at the April meeting, Mr. Kendall was willing to give special attention to these new plans submitted. It was noted that Mr. Olmsted's suggestions as to connecting roadways on Columbia Island and a small plaza were predicated on closing the Inner Channel (which the Commission of Fine Arts had decided ought not to be done since it seemed very desirable for boating purposes). The question of vista of the Mall area from the Lee Boulevard, coming down the north side of Arlington and connecting with the Arlington Memorial Bridge (at the rond point about 1100 feet north of the Memorial Bridge proper) was made the subject of an actual survey. The Mount Vernon Highway connection remains to be studied in detail when that Highway shall be built.

Mr. Moore stated that yesterday, May 27th, he and Mr. Kendall, in company with Major McHaffey, Captain Wilson of the Bureau of Public Roads and in charge of construction work of the Mount Vernon Highway, and Mr. Caemmerer, made a trip of inspection to Columbia Island, in order to give this matter personal attention; that the plans received from Colonel Grant were carefully studied in connection with the Columbia Island Plaza Plan, which had been submitted by Mr. Kendall for the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, and had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting on April 25, 1929; and that after thorough consideration of the entire scheme, it had been decided that Mr. Kendall's plan offered the best solution to the situation and that there was no reason for making any change in it; also that Major McHaffey had reported that so far as the cross-arm extending northward was concerned, so as to connect with the Lee Highway, there was a difference of only 0.92 of a foot in the surveys between Mr. Kendall's and Mr. Olmsted's plan (1100 feet vs. 1100.92 feet), which is of course negligible, the vista from the Lee Highway of the Central Composition

of Washington being therefore not affected.

The Mount Vernon Highway connection, Mr. Moore said, had also been considered with Captain Wilson, who has been furnished with a copy of Mr. Kendall's plan for the Columbia Island development; that Captain Wilson said this would be used for guidance in connection with the Mount Vernon Highway development--it is probable there will be a bridge extending from the south end of Columbia Island to connect with the main land and from there the Highway is to extend along the shores of the Potomac (via the Gravelly Point air port, if established there) thence through Alexandria to Mount Vernon. It is planned to have the Mount Vernon Highway completed by 1932, the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington.

Mr. Kendall during his inspection trip also went to the Arlington National Cemetery to consider in a preliminary way the monumental entrance planned there in connection with the Arlington Memorial Bridge. The plan prepared suggested an arched entrance 114' above grade, or one that will be when built about 56 feet high (58 feet being the ground level height at the road in front of Arlington Cemetery), and 42 feet wide. Mr. Kendall is considering the design of this entrance also in relation to the Arlington Mansion, and it will be made the subject of further study. This entrance is to have large gates to the Cemetery, and is to form the terminus of the "esplanade" which Mr. Kendall planned from the Memorial Bridge proper to Arlington, a distance of fully half a mile from Columbia Island.

The Commission of Fine Arts, after very careful consideration of the plans, decided that the plan approved at the meeting on April 25, 1929, for the treatment of Columbia Island gives the best solution to the problem and should be adhered to.

Major McHaffey submitted, in behalf of McKim, Mead and White, architects,

and the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, a General Drawing for the Bridge Plaza and Water Gate, a Plan for the Water Gate Plaza and Walls, and a Plan and Elevation for the Parkway Approach. These were inspected and approved by the Commission.

A report was sent to Col. Grant, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, accordingly (Exhibit I).

Mr. Vitale stated that Mr. Rich and Mr. Brinckerhoff, architect and landscape architect, respectively, of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, were in Washington last week and visited Arlington National Cemetery for the purpose of studying the roadways, particularly the connection of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Arlington Mansion with the Arlington Memorial Bridge; unfortunately, he said, the Quartermaster General has no funds for this work at the present time. Mr. Vitale asked if a topographic map of Arlington could be secured, and the secretary stated that he would secure one from the War Department and send it to him.

13. MERIDIAN HILL PARK: In behalf of the Office of PublicBuildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, Mr. M. W. Peaslee, architect, submitted for advice a further study for the treatment of the Grand Terrace.

The changes agreed upon with the Commission involved the substitution of wall fountains for the two archways which formerly served the entrance from Sixteenth Street and the storage space; the elimination of all spaces for storage, etc., from the body of the Grand Terrace so as to allow more room for the roots of trees, and the development of storage spaces instead under the Terrace ramps; the pulling together, by the extended use of rustication, of the central and flanking motifs of the main wall treatment at the head of the Cascades.

The Commission inspected the work in progress, and made various minor

suggestions about details of urns and obelisks, which will be revised. The Commission were very favorably impressed with the quality of the concrete work under way in the development of the Lower Garden.

Mr. Peaslee discussed with Mr. Winter the use of color and obtained his approval of strong contrasting colors, probably blues and greens, for the lining of the niches in which water is to be used. Also, Mr. Weinman concurred enthusiastically in the suggestion of Mr. Peaslee for a definite plan of development for the sculptural treatment of the entire park. The Dante statue was regarded too large in its present location, as the Jeanne d'Arc statue is too small; and the Statue of Serenity needs a better setting. With the many opportunities which are provided for additional sculpture--in the niches of the mall hedges and in the terminals of the mall walks; in the Sixteenth Street end of the Grand Terrace; in the niche opposite the small entrance on Upper Sixteenth Street; in the niche at the south end of the Lower Garden entrance plaza near Sixteenth Street,--it seemed to them a definite scheme of type, character and size of sculpture should be developed in advance, so that eventually the park will present a consistent whole. The secretary suggested to Mr. Weinman dedicating Meridian Hill Park in 1932, during the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington, and if possible have an out-door exhibition of American sculpture there at that time.

14. PLANS FOR THE MALL: The secretary called attention to Plans for the Mall and said that during Mr. Greenleaf's visit in Washington a few days ago (May 21 and 22) the question was raised as to making the grade in front of the new Agricultural Department Building on the Mall conform to the Mall grades, which would require an excavation of about 8 feet of earth; and secondly, the question where to put the earth.

Mr. Moore said the question of the Mall Development is an important one which will come before the Commission before long, as Congress has enacted legislation for its development by the Act for the Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and developing Union Station Plaza (approved March 4, 1929). It was thought the earth not needed for the Mall itself could be used for the Washington Monument grounds.

Major McHaffey said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is making a special study of the Mall, and advised withholding action in the matter until they submitted their plans.

15. NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING: Under date of May 23, 1929, the following letter was received from The Allied Architects of Washington, D.C., Inc., by Frank Upman, President, requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to their plans for the New House Office Building:

> "Our committee on design would like to have the criticism and advice of the Fine Arts Commission on designs which we are preparing for the proposed new office building for the U.S.House of Representatives.
>
> The preliminary drawings for the project are well advanced, and as we are desirous of proceeding with the working drawings as soon as possible, we will appreciate it if the Commission will review the drawings at their next meeting, which we understand is to be held in Washington, on the twenty-eighth instant.
>
> Our offices are at 16 Jackson Place (west side of Lafayette Square) and the drawings, which are quite numerous and rather bulky, can be shown to better advantage in our offices, if the Commission would be willing to meet with us there at any time convenient to them."

Also, by letter dated May 25th, Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, requested that the Commission of Fine Arts advise as to these plans, as follows:

> "The House Office Building Commission would consider it a favor if the Fine Arts Commission would examine the drawings and plans so far as they are developed of the new House Office building, these plans being in charge of Mr. Frank Upman, President of the Allied Architects of Washington, D. C."

The Commission visited the Office of the Allied Architects in the afternoon, and were in conference with Mr. Upman, Mr.Edward Donn,Jr., Prof.Murphy,

Mr. Peaslee, Mr. Wyeth, and Mr. Rodier, architects, concerning the plans. Mr. Lynn and also Mr. Alen. B. Trowbridge, Architect, who had accompanied the Commission, were present.

Mr. Upman, speaking in behalf of the Association, said that the Allied Architects had been designated by the Architect of the Capitol, Mr.Lynn, to design the building, and that it presented a very difficult problem from the standpoint of location, because of the shape and slope of the ground, and because they are required to provide a specific number of offices. The building is to be built on the square bounded by South B Street, New Jersey Avenue, C Street and South Capitol Street; the building will be 427 feet long and there will be a 37 foot drop at the C Street end.

The Commission inspected the drawings, which were quite numerous. It was stated that various schemes had been studied by the architects of the Association. The schemes submitted suggested a classical type of building, and the particular question raised was whether the building should have a resemblance to the early architecture of the Federal Government or be of the Beaux Arts style. The treatment of the facade along B Street, facing the Capitol, and along South Capitol Street--along which a development is contemplated that will probably ultimately lead to the War College, were given special attention. Among the designs submitted, one showing a pediment and columnsalong B Street (dated May 17, 1929), with a little "dome" at the top, was more especially favored; but no perspective of it had been drawn nor a design showing the relation of the building to the existing House Office Building, the Capitol, and the square to the south of the new building. It was requested that this be furnished for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts (Exhibit J)

16. FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY: Mr. Alen. B. Trowbridge, architect, submitted to the Commission informally plans prepared by him and Dr. Paul Cret, architect,

for the Folger Shakespeare Library, to be built immediately east of the Library of Congress, at Second and East Capitol Streets. Mr. Trowbridge said that Mr. Folger had collected 60,000 books on Shakespeare, 5000 paintings and 4,000 water colors pertaining to Shakespeare and his works.

The building was designed in the classical order--with a colonnade on East Capitol Street;-sculptured panels, illustrating scenes from the leading plays of Shakespeare, were planned for the facade. Mr. Trowbridge said that Mr. Folger had bought the land, but that the designs were still being studied. It is proposed to submit the completed drawings to the Commission at a later date. The Commission were highly pleased with the studies shown. Mr. Trowbridge said it is proposed to built a typical Shakespeare Theater in the building.

17. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUILDING: By letter dated May 25, 1929, Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, requested the advice of the Commission as to the model for the United States Supreme Court Building, as follows:

> ----"It will also be considered a favor to the U. S. Supreme Court Building Commission, if the Commission of which you are chairman, will examine plans and models for the new Supreme Court Building, now on exhibition at the Senate Office Building in the room especially prepared for that purpose near the Senate Post Office."

The Commission inspected the designs and model, which were made by Mr. Cass Gilbert, Architect, in the Senate Office Building,in the afternoon. The model presented a particularly fine appearance and was considered to be well related to the location, on the square immediately east of the Capitol and north of the Library of Congress, bounded by East Capitol Street, First Street, Maryland Avenue, and Second Street, Northeast. Its relation to the Capitol Group had also been considered, and the design was regarded appropriate for it.

The arrangement of the building was regarded very fitting for the needs

of the United States Supreme Court Building--on the first floor is to be the Supreme Court Chamber, measuring 50' x 50'; and suites for the Associate Justices; on the second floor will be conference rooms and suites for attorneys; on the third floor will be the Law Library.

The Commission were much pleased with the designs and model and approved them (Exhibit K) (See also K-1).

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Mr. Trowbridge, Major Mehaffey, and Mr. Kendall. After inspecting the model of the United States Supreme Court building, in the Senate Office Building, the Commission inspected the site of the proposed new House Office Building, south of the Capitol; the Commission then inspected Meridian Hill Park; also the Durex pavement on M Street at Georgetown, and the Amesite pavement in the White House Grounds. The Commission adjourned at 5:45 p.m.; the next meeting to be in New York City at the Office of McKim, Mead and White, on Monday July 1, 1929.

COPY

May 28, 1929.

Dear General Fuller:

Your letter of May 1st, and the revised design proposed for the Expeditionary Medal of the Marine Corps, were submitted to the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, Mr. Adolph A. Weinman. Mr. Weinman inspected the design, and the Commission of Fine Arts concur in his report and recommendations, as follows:

'After a careful study of the design by Captain John W. Thomason for the proposed Expeditionary Medal, I would say that while the design has possibilities for rendering in medallic form, but not knowing anything about Captain Thomason's experience in sculpture nor especially in the handling of medallic design (he being described as an illustrator), I naturally hesitate to give my approval. The making of an excellent medal being one of the most difficult tasks for even an experienced sculptor, and having seen no work along this line by Captain Thomason, I would suggest that he be requested to furnish a plastic sketch model showing the general composition, as well as the treatment of relief. In my opinion a single figure of a Marine in full campaign equipment would produce a more striking composition. The sketch is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Brigadier General S. D. Fuller,
Acting Commandant, U. S. Marine Corps,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A

COPY

May 31, 1929.

Dear Mr. Luce:

The late Congressman Sullivan introduced a Bill to purchase a bust of former Speaker Gillett by Joseph A. Atchison. Mr. Atchison said you sent him to the Commission of Fine Arts in regard to the matter. I spoke to Senator Gillett about the bust and he wrote that the portrait of him as Speaker seemed to him quite sufficient and that the Bill was introduced without his knowledge or consent and that he was opposed to it regardless of the merits of the bust.

The Commission of Fine Arts, after looking at the model, were of the opinion that it would not add to the art features of the Capitol, and disapproved it. I suppose that under the circumstances nothing further will come of the matter, unless the sculptor gets someone else to introduce a Bill to purchase the bust.

I thought you should be informed as to Senator Gillett's feeling in the matter.

Sincerely yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. Robert Luce, Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

COPY

House of Representatives, U.S.
Committee on the Library
Washington, D. C.

June 5, 1929.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

I thank you for the information contained in your letter of the 31st regarding the bust of Mr. Gillett made by Joseph A. Atchison. There is little likelihood of any action being taken in the matter, even if a bill should be introduced for the purchase of the bust.

Yours very truly,
Robert Luce

Exhibit B-1

Exhibit C-1

COPY

May 23, 1929.

My dear Mr. Postmaster General:

As requested in your letter of May 14, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, considered the question of erecting on the Washington City Post Office building a flag-pole shorter than the one recently blown down, and ornamented with a ball instead of an eagle--with the purpose of getting stability in wind storms.

The matter was brought to the attention of the architects, Graham, Anderson, Probst and White, of Chicago (successors of the architects of the building), who recommend a flag-pole 40 feet high with a standard ball, omitting the eagle. This is in accord with the recommendation of the supervising architect's office. In this the Commission concurs.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Walter F. Brown,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit C

Mon. Walter T. Brown,

Postmaster General,

Washington, D. C.

Sir:

71ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 686

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 29, 1929

MR. CAPPER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To amend an Act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, be, and it is hereby, amended by adding at the end of paragraph 5 of said Act the following provisos:

"*And provided further*, That the building to be erected on property known as the Dean tract, comprising nine and one-fourth acres, bounded on the west by Connecticut Avenue and Columbia Road, on the south by Florida

EXHIBIT D.

Avenue, on the east by Nineteenth Street, and on the north by a property line running east and west five hundred and sixty-four feet in length, said building to cover an area not exceeding fourteen thousand square feet and to be located on said property not less than forty feet distant from the north property line, not less than three hundred and twenty feet distant from the Connecticut Avenue property line, not less than one hundred and sixty feet distant from the Nineteenth Street property line, and not less than three hundred and sixty feet distant from the Florida Avenue line, measured at the point on the Florida Avenue boundary where the center line of Twentieth Street meets said boundary, be permitted to be erected to a height not to exceed one hundred and eighty feet above the level of the existing grade at the center of the location above described: *And provided further,* That the design of said building and the layout of said ground be subject to approval by the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, both of the District of Columbia."

71st CONGRESS
1st SESSION

S. 686

A BILL

To amend an Act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910.

By Mr. CAPPER

APRIL 29, 1929

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

COPY

June 4, 1929.

Dear Mr. Corbett:

Your letter of May 22d, concerning the United Masonic Temple to be built on Temple Heights in this city, was placed before the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1929, and received careful consideration. The photographs submitted of your plans for the building were inspected with interest.

The Commission of Fine Arts concur in your suggestion that the height restriction of 90' be waived as pertaining to your building. We secured a copy of the Senate Bill (S 666), introduced by Senator Capper on April 29, 1929, having in view an amendment to the "Height of Buildings Act approved June 1, 1910", so as to permit the erection of a building on the Dean Tract "to a height not to exceed one hundred and eighty feet". We believe this is the Bill to which you refer in your letter.

The Commission advise that in granting the request for a change in the building height restriction, assurance should be given that no additional building will be erected on the Dean Tract without specific approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. This will protect your building in the future, so far as landscape setting is concerned, in the event an attractive offer should be received to sell part of the unoccupied area for building purposes. I enclose a copy of the suggested revised Bill.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Harvey Wiley Corbett, Esq.,
130 West 42d Street,
New York, N.Y.

Exhibit D-1

Exhibit D-1

WHEREAS, The owners of the Dean tract, comprising nine and one quarter acres of land, situated in the District of Columbia, at the northeast corner of Connecticut and Florida Avenues, propose to erect thereon a group of buildings, monumental in character and ornamental to the City of Washington; and,

WHEREAS, In order to secure and to preserve such monumental and ornamental character it is desirable that the central feature in such group shall rise to a height of approximately 180 feet above the level of the present grade line and shall be maintained free from obstructing encroachments, therefore,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That in order to permit the construction of buildings of monumental character on a portion of the Dean tract at the northeast corner of Connecticut and Florida Avenues, comprising nine and one quarter acres, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to issue a permit to allow the erection of a building, approximately one hundred and eighty feet in height above the level of the existing grades, on an area not exceeding fourteen thousand square feet; PROVIDED, however, That the design and location of all buildings constructed on said Dean tract of nine and one quarter acres shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

SECTION 2. This Act, in so far as it applies, amends the Act approved June 1, 1910, regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia.

COPY

May 11, 1929.

Dear Mr. Coleman:

I spent Wednesday and Thursday in Charleston and in company with the army officer in charge, Major Meade, and Mr. Simons, architect, visited Fort Sumter. I was agreeably surprised and impressed with the commanding site selected for the flagpole.

After the evacuation of Fort Sumter by Major Anderson and his men the fort was twice battered to pieces by Federal fire. In all the fort was under fire between 500 and 600 days. A considerable portion of the old fortification remains, including the sally-port rebuilt by the Confederates in granite. This sally-port is as fresh and fine as if it were built yesterday. The old brick walls are intact for a considerable extent and afford a very interesting object of pilgrimage. Charleston is getting to be more and more a spring resort and the visitors naturally go to Fort Sumter. About 100 a day may be counted upon, but often this number is increased to 300 or 400.

I went over the design with the architect with the result of simplifying it greatly and thereby realizing a much larger sum for the distinctly memorial portion. The idea now is to use a monumental granite base having for its central feature a medallion portrait of Major Anderson, accompanied by a suitable inscription, which will embody the name of Mrs. Lawton and the Act of Congress authorizing the memorial. We decided that it was unnecessary to do anything in regard to the treatment of the sunken portion behind the flagpole. The old barracks have been about three-fourths removed by the Government and the remaining quarter will naturally disappear. The fort itself is an essential part of the harbor defenses and is to be improved by the Government, so that the place will become one of increasing importance. While there is only a lighthouse keeper and his family and one caretaker detailed from the army, there is a force of 600 soldiers at Fort Moultrie directly across from Fort Sumter.

I was wonderfully impressed by the city of Charleston itself,--its fine public buildings and the great number of fine old residences, which are fast being improved together with their gardens. I have a number of friends among the old residents of Charleston and they made the visit most agreeable and entered very heartily into the plans for the flagpole and its setting.

Very truly yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. John B. Coleman,
50 Broad Street,
New York, N. Y.

Exhibit E

Exhibit D

COPY

June 1, 1929.

Dear Mr. Simons:

The Commission of Fine Arts discussed the question of a pedestal for the flagpole at Fort Sumter, at their meeting on May 28th, and inclined rather to your idea of a number of steps up to the pole, so I am enclosing a suggestion. I am also trying to find out about carving the granite base with medallion and inscription from a model.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Exhibit F

Mr. Albert Simons,
Simons and Lapham, Architects,
42 Broad Street,
Charleston, S. C.

/

Exhibit X

COPY

May 29, 1929.

Dear Mr. Whyte:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, approved the design submitted by you for a new handrail on the Connecticut Avenue Bridge with balusters, with the recommendation that a model of a baluster be made.

The Commission understand that in view of the stronger handrail provided by balusters, the posts and chain heretofore suggested at the edge of the sidewalk on the bridge will not be used.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. C. R. Whyte,
Engineer of Bridges
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit G

OLMSTED BROTHERS

Landscape Architects

Brookline, Massachusetts

Western Office

April 22, 1929.

Mr. Charles W. Eliot, 2nd, City Planner,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Eighteenth & B Streets,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Eliot:

Referring to your letter of April 9th and the enclosed blueprints (1.9-66, - 68, -73): -

(1) The design of the plaza at the bridge-head on Columbia Island, in 1.9-66, seems to me open to some serious objections. The introduction of the diagonal roads complicates the form of the plaza and complicates traffic handling, and the short distances between the three bridges over the inner channel seem to me very unfortunate. It was I who suggested bringing the Lee Boulevard in at this point, I believe, but that idea was predicated on doing away with the inner channel, and in making it I may have underestimated the bad effect of the diagonals on the architectural style of the bridge-head plaza as designed by McKim, Meade and White. Certainly if the inner channel is to be retained and probably in any case I would prefer the simpler plaza design shown in 1.9-68 and 1.9-73 to that of 1.9-66.

(2) I think that the short straight pieces of road on the transverse axis of the bridge-head plaza, ending in circles, as shown on 1.9-73, would not be very effective in appearance, that the positions of the circles are very arbitrary and meaningless, that the position into which the northerly one forces the Lee Boulevard is very much too

EXHIBIT H

close to the axis of the Mall and makes the composition of the view from the lower end of that Boulevard toward the Lincoln Memorial and Washington Monument and Capitol Dome distressingly bad. You will remember I checked up this composition by observation on the ground from points near the axis of the Mall in the neighborhood of the Rosslyn Georgetown road, and I am very strong in my conviction that any important points of view of the Lincoln Memorial from this general vicinity ought at almost any cost to be kept far enough from the axis to avoid the bad composition which I observed when in the sector very near the axis. The location of the Lee Boulevard on 1.9-68 appears to be better in this respect than on 1.9-73 only in the portion between the relocated railroad and the river. Whether it is enough better to accomplish the desired result I don't know. That can be determined only by plotting the northerly limit of the views of the Lincoln Memorial which have a composition of a given degree of agreeableness.

It may be that the best location for the Lee Boulevard would be like that in 1.9-68, but slightly further south in the portion between the river and the point where the location of the Lee Boulevard on 1.9-66 coincides with that on 1.9-68.

(3) I do not at all like the three-way split of the south road on 1.9-68 and do not see any sufficient reason for it. I have no definite opinion whether the "Richmond Highway" should run to the Military Road at a point east of the railroad as in 1.9-73 or cross both the inner channel and the railroad within 1500 feet south of the Memorial Bridge axis and cut diagonally across the Arlington Farm property as in 1.9-68; but I see no excuse for doing both. I incline to favor the former as the more economical and as leaving a larger area for an unbroken addition to Arlington Cemetery.

Sincerely yours,

F. L. Olmsted

COPY

May 31, 1929.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 28, 1929, considered the plans submitted with your letter of May 8th, together with a copy of a letter received from Mr. Olmsted, as to the treatment of the roadways on Columbia Island connecting with the Arlington Memorial Bridge,--calling attention particularly to the proposed Lee Highway connection.

The plans were brought to the attention of Mr. Vitale, who took up the matter with Mr. Kendall, and they agreed that the alignment of the Lee Highway should, if possible, be such that when a view of the city is obtained the composition of the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and the Capitol Dome, should be as pleasing as possible.(1) To accomplish this, Mr. Kendall expressed his willingness to give the project further study in connection with the Plan for Columbia Island submitted by him and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on April 25, 1929. A copy of this plan is enclosed.

Mr. Kendall spent all day Monday, May 27th, going over the ground on Columbia Island in person, along the Virginia shore, and through Arlington National Cemetery, making a careful study of the project.

As to the Lee Highway connection at the rond point, at the end of

(1) The effort to keep an axis of vision should be abandoned as leading to strain on the part of the observer in trying to keep the line of Memorial, Monument, and Capitol. The plan carries out Mr. Olmsted's pertinent suggestion that the line of vision lie within the Central Composition.

(1)
The object to keep in mind in obtaining a
to attain on the part of the observer in trying to map the line of
Central Superposition.

the cross arm extending northward from the Columbia Island Plaza, Major Meharffey reported that the difference in length to the point of intersection at this location, or the rend point, is only 0.92 of a foot, between Mr. Kendall's plan and Mr. Olmsted's plan!

Captain Wilson of the Bureau of Public Roads was present during the inspection on Columbia Island, so that consideration was also given to the Mount Vernon Highway connection with the Arlington Memorial Bridge. He has been furnished with a copy of the enclosed Columbia Island Plaza plan, and will use it for guidance in connection with the Mount Vernon Highway project.

After thorough consideration of the project it was decided that Mr. Kendall's plan gives the best method of treatment for Columbia Island in relation to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the Lee Highway, the Mount Vernon Highway, and Arlington National Cemetery. The entire matter was brought before the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 28, 1929, and the Commission decided unanimously that Mr. Kendall's approved plan for Columbia Island should be adhered to.

Major Meharffey submitted a General Drawing for the Bridge Plaza and Water Gate, a Plan for the Water Gate Plaza and Walls, and a Plan and Elevation for the Parkway Approach. These were approved by the Commission.

Mr. Kendall, during his visit in Washington, made a preliminary study on the ground of the monumental entrance planned for Arlington National Cemetery, in connection with the Arlington Memorial Bridge. This he brought to the attention of the Commission, and it will be made the subject of further study.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I

ARLINGTON CEMETERY

SEE ADDITION TO ARLINGTON CEMETERY

MEMORIAL BRIDGE

POTOMAC RIVER

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

McKIM MEAD AND WHITE - ARCHITECTS
W. J. DOUGLAS - CONSULTING ENGINEER

GENERAL PLAN
ENTIRE PROJECT WITH CONNECTING ROADS
AS PROPOSED

COPY

May 29, 1929.

Dear Mr. Lynn:

In accordance with your request of May 25th, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, inspected the plans prepared by The Allied Architects of Washington, D.C., Inc., for the new Office Building of the House of Representatives. The Commission favored an elevation with pediment on E Street (dated May 17, 1929). However, before submitting a report to you in the matter, the Commission ask that a drawing be prepared showing the building in perspective, and in relation to the existing House Office Building and the Capitol; also taking into consideration a building that will doubtless be erected in the future on the square south of the proposed House Office Building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Copy to Mr. Upman.

Exhibit J

Mr. David Lynn,
Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. David Lynch
Apocalypse of the Imagined
Wuppertal, F.R.G.

COPY

May 29, 1929.

Dear Mr. Lynn:

In compliance with the request of the United States Supreme Court Building Commission, conveyed in your letter of May 25th, the Commission of Fine Arts, on May 28, 1929, examined the model and plans prepared by Mr. Cass Gilbert, architect, and unanimously approved the same.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Mr. David Lynn,
Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Exhibit K

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, D.C.

June 1, 1929.

My dear Mr. Moore:

I thank you for your personal letter in respect to the models and the plans. It is of course most gratifying for the Commission to find approval by your Fine Arts Commission, and I sincerely hope that it may carry conviction with the Congress that has to act upon our report, as I hope it may. It was very good of you, too, to act so promptly in the matter. It is quite possible--I hope it may be so--that the Building Committees of Congress will seek to examine some members of your Commission for further inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Wm. H. Taft.

Cass Gilbert, Architect
344 Madison Avenue, New York.

May 29, 1929.

Mr. Charles Moore,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Your note of May 28th has just come in and I hasten to thank you for it and to tell you that I am very much gratified at the action of the Commission of Fine Arts.

I have taken the liberty of putting your letter to Chief Justice Taft as I am sure it will be of great interest to him.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Exhibit K-1

Cass Gilbert.